

10/646,424

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 16, 18-22, 24 and 25 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, as being anticipated in view of Sedlack '066. The Applicant acknowledges and respectfully traverses the raised anticipatory rejection in view of the following remarks.

As previously noted, Sedlack '066 relates to a harness for fixing a child seat to a school bus seat. The harness is made of a belt 28 with two opposing ends. At each end of the belt is a fastening member. Each fastening member comprises a buckle which is of a conventional seat belt buckle design; that is, each buckle has a male portion 35 and 37 and a female portion 42 and 44 which communicate with each other to become securely fastened to one another. In use, a first male portion of a buckle with its respective end of the belt 28 is passed through a channel in a baby seat. Then each of the male portions are respectively secured into a female portion of the buckle. The user then pulls on a tensioning end of the belt 28 to tighten the child seat into the bus seat. The harness has a lateral belt 30 which is stitched to the belt 28 near the two opposing ends.

This harness system is distinctly different from the currently claimed application for a variety of reasons. It is not understood how the belt portion 28 of large loop harness attaches to the car seat. In the one figure that shows the harness in use, communicating with the child seat, the belt portion 28 is cut away when used with the rear facing child seat and appears to be loosely laying underneath the front portion of the front facing child seat. The description of that portion of the strap (column 2, lines 64-65) suggests that the belt is wrapped around the child seat.

The belt 25 includes a lateral portion 30 which, if used as suggested by Figure 1, would preclude the adjustability of the strap by means of the tensioning buckle 36 on the end of the belt as there is no adjustment means available from one buckle 35,42 along lateral portion 30 to the second buckle 37, 44. If the strap 28 is passed through the child seat as suggested (column 2, lines 64-65), the Applicant fails to understand the significance of the lateral belt portion 30.

The harness of Sedlack '066 is not in any way fixed to the child seat. Neither the strap 28 or the lateral strap 30 have any means of being secured to the child seat to retain the location of the strap in relation to the child seat. The harness of Sedlack '066 may be fixed in a strap duct, but it is certainly not fixed to the car seat in a strap duct as currently claimed in the present application.

The claims of the current application, on the other hand, recite that the connecting strap 6 is fixed to the child car seat in the strap duct 7. As can be seen in the Figures, a bracket 13 and a rivet 15 are used inside the rear strap path 7 to ensure that the connecting strap 6

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

10/646,424

cannot be removed from the child car seat. As asserted above, there is no such teaching in the cited art of Sedlack '066 of such feature.

The presently claimed invention is believed to be suitably distinguished from the applied art by the inclusion, at the very least, of the feature of "the connecting strap passing through and being fixed in a strap duct in the child car seat". Such feature is believed to clearly and patentably distinguish the presently claimed invention from all of the art of record, including the applied art of Sedlack '066.

Next, claims 1-8, 16, and 18-25 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, as being anticipated in view of Kain '183 while claims 9-15 and 17 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable in view of Kain '183. The Applicant acknowledges and respectfully traverses the raised obviousness rejection in view of the following remarks.

As previously noted, Kain '183 relates to an anchor system for a child car seat. The anchor system includes an anchor belt 16 comprising a strap 40 which has a clasp 42 located at either of the two ends of the strap 40. This strap 40 extends from one anchor mount 18 through the a pair of slots 34 in the child seat to a second anchor mount 18. A leash 20 extends from the middle of strap 40. One end of the leash 20 is coupled to the child seat using a rivet 48. In short; a leash is coupled to the child seat not the anchor belt 16 as recited by the presently pending claims.

The current application, on the other hand, recites a connecting strap 6 having latches at either end thereof to engage with latching bars of the vehicle. This connecting strap is connected to one latching bar at a first end then passes through and is fixed to a child car seat in a strap duct and is connected to a second latching bar at a second end. As recited, the connecting strap 6 is securely fixed to the child car seat in the strap duct 7. As can be seen in the Figures, a bracket 13 and a rivet 15 are used inside the rear strap path 7 to ensure that the connecting strap 6 cannot be removed from the child car seat. As discussed above, there is no such teaching, suggestion or motivation of the same in the cited art of Kain '183.

As noted above, the presently claimed invention is distinguished from the applied art by the inclusion, at the very least, of the feature of "the connecting strap passing through and being fixed in a strap duct in the child car seat". Such feature is believed to clearly and patentably distinguish the presently claimed invention from all of the art of record, including the applied art of Kain '183.

In the outstanding official action, the Examiner indicates that features upon which the Applicant relies are not positively recited in the claims since the Applicant only functionally recites the child seat. The pending claims are suitably amended to now positively recite the

Best Available Copy

10/646,424

child seat. In view of such amendment and the above remarks, the presently claimed invention is now believed to be clearly distinguished from the applied art.

If any further amendment to this application is believed necessary to advance prosecution and place this case in allowable form, the Examiner is courteously solicited to contact the undersigned representative of the Applicant to discuss the same.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the raised rejection(s) should be withdrawn at this time. If the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's view concerning the withdrawal of the outstanding rejection(s) or applicability of the Sedlack '066 and/or Kain '183 references, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the specific passage or passages, or the drawing or drawings, which contain the necessary teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure required by case law. As such teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure is not present in the applied references, the raised rejection should be withdrawn at this time. Alternatively, if the Examiner is relying on his/her expertise in this field, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter an affidavit substantiating the Examiner's position so that suitable contradictory evidence can be entered in this case by the Applicant.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the raised rejection(s) should be withdrawn and this application is now placed in a condition for allowance. Action to that end, in the form of an early Notice of Allowance, is courteously solicited by the Applicant at this time.

The Applicant respectfully requests that any outstanding objection(s) or requirement(s), as to the form of this application, be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated for this case.

In the event that there are any fee deficiencies or additional fees are payable, please charge the same or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account (Account No. 04-0213).

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Bujold, Reg. No. 32,018
Customer No. 020210
Davis & Bujold, P.L.L.C.
Fourth Floor
500 North Commercial Street
Manchester NH 03101-1151
Telephone 603-624-9220
Facsimile 603-624-9229
E-mail: patent@davisandbujold.com

BEST AVAILABLE COPY